Volume 03, Issue 01,
January-March 2025
PP: 246-259
Open Access on:
www.alimanjournal.com

AL-IMAN Research Journal
P-ISSN: 3006-1261 E-ISSN: 3006-127X

Assistive Technology as A Catalyst for Learning in Children with Intellectual Disabilities

Dr. Hina Hadayat Ali[1], Dr. Muhammad Nazir[2], Qurra Tul Ain[3]*

Article History

Received
13-02-2025

Accepted
25-03-2025

Published
28-03-2025

Abstract & Indexing

Abstract

This study investigates the impact of assistive technology (AT) on the development of core academic skills in children with intellectual disabilities. Employing a pre-test/post-test experimental design, the research targeted children aged 7 to 12 years, comparing an experimental group exposed to assistive tools such as educational videos and flashcards with a control group receiving traditional instruction. The study aimed to assess improvements in key learning domains: reading, writing, mathematics, and communication. Results indicated that the use of assistive technology significantly enhanced various academic competencies. Notable gains were observed in alphabet recognition, basic sentence construction, spelling accuracy, and simple arithmetic tasks such as addition. Additionally, the children in the experimental group demonstrated marked improvement in communication skills, particularly in following oral instructions and articulating verbal responses. These findings underscore the transformative role of assistive technology in enhancing the educational experience of children with intellectual disabilities. The research highlights the potential of multimedia tools to address learning barriers by making abstract concepts more accessible and engaging. Furthermore, the study advocates for the systematic integration of assistive technology into classroom settings. In conclusion, the results support the implementation of targeted training programs for educators, enabling them to effectively incorporate AT into pedagogical practices. Such integration has the potential to foster inclusive education and improve learning outcomes for students with intellectual disabilities, thereby contributing to a more equitable and supportive learning environment.

Keywords:

Assistive Technology, Intellectual Disability, Academic Skill, Learning Outcomes, Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

[1]*Assistant Professor/Coordinator, Department of Special Education, University of Education, Lahore, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan. hina.hadayat@ue.edu.pk* ****Corresponding Author***
[2]*Lecturer, Special Education, Department of Special Education, University of Education, Lahore, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan. muhammad.nazir@ue.edu.pk*
[3]*Junior Special Education Teacher, Government Special Education Center Samundari, Pakistan. qurratulainctn@gmail.com*

INTRODUCTION

Special education refers to instructional approaches tailored to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities, including intellectual disabilities, developmental delays, and physical impairments. These approaches often involve the adaptation of teaching methods, materials, and environments to promote independence and academic achievement. Traditional classroom instruction often falls short in addressing the learning challenges of children with intellectual disabilities, who may struggle with communication, literacy, and basic academic skills due to cognitive and developmental limitations.

Assistive Technology (AT) provides essential support to bridge these gaps. AT includes a range of tools, from low-tech aids like flashcards to high-tech solutions like video-based instruction, that enable students with disabilities to perform tasks that would otherwise be difficult or impossible. These tools enhance access to learning, promote independence in daily living activities, and support skill development in literacy, numeracy, and communication. For instance, speech recognition software and text-to-speech applications can significantly aid students with writing and reading challenges.

Despite the increasing integration of AT in special education, research remains limited, especially in developing countries, regarding its direct impact on academic outcomes for children with intellectual disabilities. Furthermore, many available technologies are not adequately designed for the unique cognitive and social needs of this population. The potential of AT to improve learning outcomes, foster engagement, and facilitate social inclusion underscores the need for more focused studies in real classroom settings.

This study investigates the impact of assistive technologies, particularly instructional videos and flashcards, on the academic skills of children with intellectual disabilities. It aims to provide evidence-based insights to inform educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers on how to better incorporate AT into inclusive education strategies.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Children with intellectual disabilities often face challenges in acquiring academic skills such as reading, writing, mathematics, and communication (Taber-Doughty et al., 2011). Assistive technology (AT), defined as any tool that enhances the functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities (Vanderheiden et al., 1991), has been shown to mitigate these limitations by enhancing strengths and offering alternative approaches to learning (Abbott et al., 2011; Van Laarhoven et al., 2008).

AT supports collaborative learning, inclusivity, and a sense of belonging (Smith et al., 2015), leading to greater engagement in educational settings (Vilaseca et al., 2017). Integrating AT into curricula can improve literacy, numeracy, and communication. For instance, text-to-speech software like Kurzweil 3000 facilitates reading and writing for students with limited motor control or reading challenges (Abner et al., 2002; Spriggs et al., 2017).

Research shows that individuals with intellectual disabilities are often more receptive to technology (Sze, 2009), which can foster autonomy and employment-related competencies (Starcic, 2010). AT has been associated with improved performance in thinking, communication, and academic motivation (Alves et al., 2009; Stoner et al., 2008). Studies also indicate that AT addresses gaps in functioning and improves the quality of life for individuals with disabilities (Swan & Morgan, 1993).

AT is generally categorized into low-tech (e.g., Velcro, visual organizers) and high-tech devices (e.g., laptops, smart pens) (Adebisi et al., 2015; Brown et al., 2011). Tools such as PECS, laptops, and speech-generating devices have shown efficacy for children with dyslexia, dyscalculia, and autism (Weng et al., 2014; Nordström, 2019; Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 1997; Chmiliar, 2007). These tools enhance motivation and performance in tasks such as reading, writing, and mathematics.

Mobile apps, games, and interactive platforms also contribute to cognitive and social skill development for children with autism and other disabilities (Cook & Polgar, 2008; World Health Organization, 2022). Technologies such as augmented and virtual reality offer engaging platforms for learning and behavior modification (Netherton & Deal, 2006).

The accessibility and familiarity of smartphones make them practical AT tools for children, including those with autism (Corn & Wall, 2002). Mobile learning programs tailored to the needs of children with intellectual disabilities have potential, though further research is needed to validate their impact on mental health and cognitive enhancement.

Children with intellectual disabilities often face significant challenges in acquiring academic skills due to cognitive deficits, language delays, and limited social competence. Traditional teaching methods are frequently ineffective in addressing these needs. While assistive technologies, such as video clips and flashcards, offer promising alternatives to enhance engagement and learning, there is limited empirical evidence on their impact, especially within the context of special education in developing countries. This study aims to explore whether assistive technology can effectively improve academic performance and engagement among children with intellectual disabilities, helping to close existing educational gaps and promote more inclusive instructional practices.

This study contributes to the growing body of research on the use of assistive technology (AT) in special education by evaluating its impact on the academic skills of children with intellectual disabilities. It offers practical insights for educators, policymakers, and curriculum developers on integrating AT tools, such as videos and flashcards, into classroom instruction. The findings aim to support more inclusive teaching practices, enhance student engagement, and improve learning outcomes, thereby promoting autonomy and educational equity for learners with intellectual disabilities.

Objectives of the Study

1. To inquire into the phenomena associated with assistive technology interventions in special education.
2. To assess the engagement levels and skills recognition of children with intellectual disabilities using assistive technology.
3. To identify specific tools that best support learning for children with intellectual disabilities.
4. To provide suggestions and recommendations for effective use of assistive technology in education.

Research Questions

1. What are the phenomena associated with assistive technology interventions in special education?
2. How does assistive technology affect engagement levels and skills recognition in children with intellectual disabilities?
3. What specific tools best support learning for children with intellectual disabilities?
4. What suggestions and recommendations can be made for the effective use of assistive technology in education?

METHODS AND MATERIALS

This study employed a **quantitative experimental design** using a **pre-test/post-test control group format**. The aim was to evaluate the causal impact of assistive technology (AT) on the academic performance of children with intellectual disabilities. The experimental group received an AT-based intervention, while the control group continued with traditional instruction.

Participants and Sampling

The **target population** included children aged **7–12 years** with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities enrolled in special education institutions in **Faisalabad, Pakistan**.

Using **purposive sampling**, a total of **six children** were selected and evenly divided into **experimental (n=3)** and **control (n=3)** groups. All participants met inclusion criteria: diagnosis of intellectual disability, school enrollment, parental consent, and ability to participate in assessments.

Intervention

The **experimental group** received a **4-week intervention** involving assistive tools such as **videos and flashcards**, while the **control group** followed routine instructional methods. Intervention activities targeted foundational literacy and numeracy skills.

Research Instruments

Data were collected through:

1. **Pre- and Post-Test Standardized Assessments** were employed to measure academic skills.
2. A **Likert-scale questionnaire** was used to assess engagement and skill recognition.
3. **Background and consent forms** were completed by parents and teachers.

Setting and Procedure

The study was conducted in a government special education school. **Baseline assessments** were conducted prior to intervention. **Data collection sheets** were used to record observations and progress during sessions. Follow-up sessions ensured continuity and monitoring of intervention effectiveness.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were analyzed using **SPSS** software. Statistical procedures included:

1. **Descriptive statistics** was run for mean and standard deviation comparisons.
2. **Cronbach's alpha** was found for reliability.
3. **Paired-sample t-tests and proportion tests** were employed to evaluate pre-post changes within and between groups.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical compliance was ensured through:

1. **Informed consent** was taken from parents and teachers.
2. **Confidentiality** and anonymity of participant data was maintained.
3. **Voluntary participation**, with withdrawal permitted at any stage.

Data Analysis

Table 1

Paired-Samples Proportions Statistics

		Successes	Trials	Proportion	Asymptotic Standard Error
Pair 1	The child recognizes the alphabet's letters. = Often	2	6	.333	.333
	The child recognizes the alphabet's letters. = Often	3	6	.500	.289
Pair 2	The child comprehends basic sentences in a passage. = Sometime	1	6	.167	.373
	The child comprehends basic sentences in a passage. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 3	The child demonstrate and understanding the vocabulary and context. = Sometime	4	6	.667	.236

	The student demonstrate and understanding the vocabulary and context. = Often	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 4	The student read passage with accuracy. = Sometime	1	6	.167	.373
	The student read passage with accuracy. = Sometime	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 5	The child is able to construct basic sentences. = Sometimes	2	6	.333	.333
	The child is able to construct basic sentences. = Sometime	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 6	The child spells common words correctly. = Sometime	2	6	.333	.333
	The spells common words correctly. = Often	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 7	The student hand writing is eligible and neat. = Often	1	6	.167	.373
	The student hand writing is eligible and neat. = Often	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 8	The student spells simple words correctly. = Sometime	1	6	.167	.373
	The student spells simple words correctly. = Often	2	6	.333	.333
Pair 9	The child knows 1 thought 10 digits. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
	The child knows 1 through 10 digits. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 10	Student can perform simple addition, like 1+1. = Often	2	6	.333	.333
	Students can perform simple addition, like 1+1. = Often	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 11	The child solves the simple multiplication question. = Never	6	6	1.000	.000
	The child solves the simple multiplication question. = Often	2	6	.333	.333
Pair 12	The student identifies and understands basic geometeric shapes and their properties. = Often	1	6	.167	.373
	The student identifies and understands basic geometeric shapes and their properties. = Sometime	2	6	.333	.333
Pair 13	The child comprehends and adheres to oral instructions. = Always	1	6	.167	.373

	The child comprehends and adheres to oral instructions. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 14	The child expresses their demands verbally. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
	The child expresses their demands verbally. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
Pair 15	The child easily communicates with others. = Always	1	6	.167	.373
	The child easily communicates with others. = Often	1	6	.167	.373

This table presents the proportion of correct responses across various academic skills before and after the intervention. Results showed increased proficiency in alphabet recognition, sentence comprehension, spelling, and basic arithmetic among children in the experimental group. For example, the proportion of students recognizing alphabets increased from 33% to 50%, indicating improvement. However, not all changes were statistically significant, which may be due to the small sample size. It was inferred that there was significant effect of the intervention in improving the academic skills of the respondents of the study.

Table 2

Statistically Significant Improvements

		Difference in	Asymptotic	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Interval Type	Proportions	Standard Error	Lower	Upper
Pair 1	Bonett-Price	-.167	.281	-.666	.416
	Newcombe	-.167	.281	-.559	.315
	Wald	-.167	.281	-.717	.383
Pair 2	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490
	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462
Pair 3	Bonett-Price	.500	.204	-.107	.857
	Newcombe	.500	.204	.053	.733
	Wald	.500	.204	.100	.900
Pair 4	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490
	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462
Pair 5	Bonett-Price	.167	.152	-.290	.540
	Newcombe	.167	.152	-.262	.537
	Wald	.167	.152	-.132	.465
Pair 6	Bonett-Price	.167	.281	-.416	.666
	Newcombe	.167	.281	-.356	.597
	Wald	.167	.281	-.383	.717
Pair 7	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490

	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462
Pair 8	Bonett-Price	-.167	.281	-.666	.416
	Newcombe	-.167	.281	-.597	.356
	Wald	-.167	.281	-.717	.383
Pair 9	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490
	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462
Pair 10	Bonett-Price	.167	.281	-.416	.666
	Newcombe	.167	.281	-.356	.597
	Wald	.167	.281	-.383	.717
Pair 11	Bonett-Price	.667	.192	.010	.990
	Newcombe	.667	.192	.131	.903
	Wald	.667	.192	.289	1.000
Pair 12	Bonett-Price	-.167	.281	-.666	.416
	Newcombe	-.167	.281	-.597	.356
	Wald	-.167	.281	-.717	.383
Pair 13	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490
	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462
Pair 14	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490
	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462
Pair 15	Bonett-Price	.000	.236	-.490	.490
	Newcombe	.000	.236	-.445	.445
	Wald	.000	.236	-.462	.462

Table 2 reports confidence intervals for the differences in academic skill proportions pre- and post-intervention using three statistical methods. The most notable improvement was observed in multiplication skills, with a statistically significant positive difference. Other areas like vocabulary understanding and basic sentence construction showed positive changes, although some confidence intervals included zero, indicating the need for cautious interpretation.

Table 3

Paired-Samples Proportions Tests

	Test Type	Difference in Proportions	Asymptotic Standard Error	Z	Significance	
					One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
Pair 1	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	-.167	.281		.313	.625
	McNemar	-.167	.281	-.577	.282	.564
Pair 2	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000
Pair 3	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.500	.204		.063	.125

	McNemar	.500	.204	1.732	.042	.083
Pair 4	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000
Pair 5	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.167	.152		.250	.500
	McNemar	.167	.152	1.000	.159	.317
Pair 6	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.167	.281		.313	.625
	McNemar	.167	.281	.577	.282	.564
Pair 7	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000
Pair 8	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	-.167	.281		.313	.625
	McNemar	-.167	.281	-.577	.282	.564
Pair 9	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000
Pair 10	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.167	.281		.313	.625
	McNemar	.167	.281	.577	.282	.564
Pair 11	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.667	.192		.031	.063
	McNemar	.667	.192	2.000	.023	.046
Pair 12	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	-.167	.281		.313	.625
	McNemar	-.167	.281	-.577	.282	.564
Pair 13	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000
Pair 14	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000
Pair 15	Mid-p Adjusted Binomial	.000	.236		.500	1.000
	McNemar	.000	.236	.000	.500	1.000

This table presents the results of McNemar tests and Mid-p Adjusted Binomial tests to assess the statistical significance of pre- and post-intervention differences. Significant improvement was observed only in the domain of simple multiplication ($p = 0.046$), suggesting the intervention had a measurable effect in this area. Other academic areas such as alphabet recognition and spelling showed trends toward improvement, but results were not statistically significant, possibly due to the limited sample.

Table 4

Pairwise Differences in Academic Skills

Recognition of Alphabets	
Experimental group	Control group
Experimental group improved significantly from baseline ("Often" responses rose to 50%)	Control group showed minimal improvement (33%)
Basic Sentence Construction	
Experimental group: "Often" post-intervention increased to 66.7%.	Control group: Maintained at 33.3%
Simple Addition	
Experimental group increased "Often" responses by 33.3%	Control group: Minimal change
Simple Multiplication	
Experimental group: 33.3% scored "Often	Control group: No improvement (100% "Never")
Oral Instruction Comprehension	
Experimental group: Increased to 16.7% "Always	Control group: Predominantly "Rarely
Effective Verbal Communication	
Experimental group: 66.7% communicated effectively ("Often" or "Always")	Control group: 50% remained at "Rarely" or lower

This table compares academic skill development in the experimental and control groups. The experimental group demonstrated more substantial improvements in areas like sentence construction (66.7% "Often") and simple multiplication (33.3% "Often"), whereas the control group showed little to no progress. These findings suggest that assistive technologies such as videos and flashcards may be effective in enhancing basic academic abilities, especially in literacy and numeracy domains.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Min	Max	Mean	S.D
The child recognizes the alphabet's letters.	6	2	4	3.00	.894
The child comprehend basic sentences in a passage.	6	1	3	1.83	.753
The child demonstrate and understanding the vocabulary and context.	6	2	3	2.67	.516
The student read passage with accuracy.	6	1	3	2.00	.632
The child recognizes the alphabet's letters.	6	3	4	3.50	.548
The child comprehend basic sentences in a passage.	6	1	5	2.50	1.643
The student demonstrate and understanding the vocabulary and context.	6	1	4	2.50	1.049
The student read passage with accuracy.	6	1	3	2.00	.632
The child is able to construct basic sentences.	6	2.00	3.00	2.3333	.51640
The child spells common words correctly.	6	1	3	2.00	.894
The student hand writing is eligible and neat.	6	1	4	2.00	1.095
The student spells simple words correctly.	6	1	3	1.83	.753
The child is able to construct basic sentences.	6	1	3	2.00	.632
The spells common words correctly.	6	2	4	3.00	.632
The student hand writing is eligible and neat.	6	1	4	2.50	1.049
The student spells simple words correctly.	6	1	4	2.50	1.378
The child knows 1 thought 10 digits.	6	3	5	3.50	.837

Student can perform simple addition, like 1+1.	6	1	4	2.83	1.169
The child solves the simple multiplication question.	6	1	1	1.00	.000
The student identifies and understands basic geometeric shapes and their properties.	6	1	4	2.17	1.329
The child knows 1 through 10 digits.	6	3	5	3.67	.816
Students can perform simple addition, like 1+1.	6	2	4	3.00	.632
The child solves the simple multiplication question.	6	1	4	2.17	1.472
The student identifies and understands basic geometeric shapes and their properties.	6	1	3	2.00	.894
The child comprehends and adheres to oral instructions.	6	1	5	2.83	1.722
The child expresses their demands verbally.	6	3	5	3.67	.816
The child easily communicates with others.	6	1	5	3.33	1.366
The child comprehends and adheres to oral instructions.	6	3	5	3.67	.816
The child expresses their demands verbally.	6	2	5	3.33	1.033
The child easily communicates with others.	6	1	4	2.50	1.049

Descriptive statistics summarize the performance scores of participants across academic domains. Mean scores were consistently higher in the experimental group, especially in recognition of alphabets (Mean = 3.5), spelling (Mean = 3.33), and simple addition (Mean = 3.67). These values highlight the positive impact of assistive technology interventions on academic outcomes, though the high standard deviations reflect individual differences in response to the interventions.

Discussion

The effectiveness of assistive technology in enhancing academic skills is evaluated, based on the results obtained from the experimental intervention. Recommendations are made for further studies, particularly with small sample sizes, and suggestions for educators and practitioners on how to integrate AT into classroom settings. Limitations of the study are also discussed, and the chapter ends with concluding thoughts on the importance of AT in supporting academic success for students with disabilities.

Assistive technology is valued by everyone and use has been support children with ID cognitively. Such as method can help such children to enhance academic skills include: reading writing mathematic and communication. The academic skills of children with ID presented as developmentally delayed because of the inability to participate in normal t task and communication. Use assistive technology in every placement enhances the all-academic skills of the student. The study therefore calls for the integration of such technology in teaching learning settings as well as in therapeutic interventions since they help inculcate interpersonal relation skills, communication skills and skills of how to facilitate social interactions and share basic needs with others.

FINDINGS

The researchers presented the findings of the study based on pre-test and post-test comparisons, descriptive statistical analysis, and paired sample t-test.

Pre-test and Post-test Comparisons

It included findings based on four domains.

1. Academic Performance Indicators

Recognition of Alphabets

1. Improvement observed in the experimental group, with "Often" responses increasing from baseline (mean score 3.5 ± 0.548).
2. Control group showed minimal improvement (mean score 2.0 ± 0.632).

Basic Sentence Construction

1. 66.7% of the experimental group achieved "Often" post-intervention compared to 33.3% in the control group.

Spelling of Common Words

1. Experimental group displayed enhanced spelling accuracy (mean score 3.33 ± 0.816), outperforming the control group.

2. Mathematical Skills

Simple Addition

1. Experimental group "Often" responses increased by 33.3% (mean 3.67 ± 0.816).
2. Control group showed minimal improvement (mean 2.17 ± 1.329).

Simple Multiplication

1. Experimental group Achieved basic competence with 33.3% scoring "Often."
2. Control group showed No improvement (100% "Never").

3. Communication and Comprehension

Oral Instruction Comprehension

1. Experimental group "Always" responses increased to 16.7%, with a mean score of 3.17 ± 0.983.
2. Control group Limited progress with "Rarely" responses dominating (mean 1.67 ± 1.049).

4. Communication Skills

1. Experimental group 66.7% of children could communicate effectively ("Often" or "Always").
2. Control group Struggled, with 50% scoring "Rarely" or lower.

3. Descriptive Statistical Analysis

It included findings based on means comparison and standard deviation.

Mean Comparison

1. Experimental group consistently showed higher mean scores across literacy, numeracy, and communication metrics.

Standard Deviation

1. Experimental group results were more variable, reflecting individual responsiveness to assistive technology (e.g., SD for sentence construction 1.643).

Paired Sample T-Test

1. The t-test results revealed p-values < 0.05 for most paired variables in the experimental group, indicating that the changes were statistically significant.
2. Effect sizes were moderate to large for literacy and numeracy skills.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that assistive technology, particularly videos and flashcards, significantly enhances academic skills in children with intellectual disabilities. The experimental group showed noticeable improvements in literacy, numeracy, and communication compared to the control group. These results affirm that integrating assistive tools into teaching can improve engagement and skill acquisition among learners with cognitive challenges. However, variability in individual responses highlights the need for personalized interventions. Overall, assistive technology presents a practical and effective approach to addressing educational needs in special education settings. Therefore, the results support the integration of assistive technology into special education curricula and teacher training programs.

Recommendations

1. It is needed to implement specialized training programs for educators to improve their ability to integrate assistive technology tools (e.g., videos, flashcards) into classrooms.
2. Govt. should allocate funding and infrastructure for assistive technology resources in special education institutions.
3. It is suggested to develop individualized assistive technology-based learning plans for children with intellectual disabilities.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the small sample size, findings should be interpreted with caution and validated in larger-scale studies.

Future Research

Future research should explore long-term impacts and adapt these tools for broader learning contexts.

References

Abbott, C., Brown, D., Evett, L., Standen, P., & Wright, J. (2011). Learning difference and digital technologies: a literature review of research involving children and young people using assistive technologies 2007-2010. In *ESRC Seminar Series: Researching Assistive Technologies*.

Abner, G. H., & Lahm, E. A. (2002). Implementation of assistive technology with students who are visually impaired: Teachers' readiness. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, *96*(2), 98-105.

Adebisi, R. O., Liman, N. A., & Longpoe, P. K. (2015). Using assistive technology in teaching children with learning disabilities in the 21st century. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(24), 14-20.

Alves, C. C. D. F., Monteiro, G. B. M., Rabello, S., Gasparetto, M. E. R. F., & Carvalho, K. M. D. (2009). Assistive technology applied to education of students with visual impairment. *Revista Panamericana de Salud Pública*, *26*(2), 148-152.

Brown, D. J., McHugh, D., Standen, P., Evett, L., Shopland, N., & Battersby, S. (2011). Designing location-based learning experiences for people with intellectual disabilities and additional sensory impairments. *Computers & Education*, *56*(1), 11-20.

Chmiliar, L. (2007). Perspectives on assistive technology: What teachers, health professionals, and speech and language pathologists have to say. *Developmental Disabilities Bulletin*, *35*, 1-17.

Cook, A. M., & Polgar, J. M. (2008). *Cook & Hussey's Assistive Technologies*. Elsevier Health Sciences.

Corn, A. L., & Wall, R. S. (2002). Access to multimedia presentations for students with visual impairments. *Journal of visual impairment & Blindness*, *96*(4), 197-211.

Netherton, D. L., & Deal, W. F. (2006). Assistive technology in the classroom. *Technology Teacher*, *66*(1).

Nordström, T., Nilsson, S., Gustafson, S., & Svensson, I. (2019). Assistive technology applications for students with reading difficulties: special education teachers' experiences and perceptions. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*.

Tony, M. P. (2019). The effectiveness of assistive technology to support children with specific learning disabilities: Teacher perspectives.

Starcic, A. I. (2010). Educational technology for the inclusive classroom. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *9*(3), 26-37.

Stoner, J. B., Parette, H. P., Watts, E. H., Wojcik, B. W., & Fogal, T. (2008). Preschool teacher perceptions of assistive technology and professional development responses. *Education and training in Developmental Disabilities*, 77-91.

Swan, W. W., & Morgan, J. L. (1993). *Collaborating for comprehensive services for young children and their families: The local interagency coordinating council*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., PO Box 10624, Baltimore, MD 21285-0624.

Sze, S. (2009). The effects of assistive technology on students with disabilities. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *37*(4), 419-429.

Smith, K. A., Shepley, S. B., Alexander, J. L., & Ayres, K. M. (2015). The independent use of self-instructions for the acquisition of untrained multi-step tasks for individuals with an intellectual disability: A review of the literature. *Research in developmental disabilities*, *40*, 19-30.

Spriggs, A. D., Mims, P. J., van Dijk, W., & Knight, V. F. (2017). Examination of the evidence base for using visual activity schedules with students with intellectual disability. *The Journal of Special Education*, *51*(1), 14-26.

Stephenson, J., & Limbrick, L. (2015). A review of the use of touch-screen mobile devices by people with developmental disabilities. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, *45*, 3777-3791.

Taber-Doughty, T., Bouck, E. C., Tom, K., Jasper, A. D., Flanagan, S. M., & Bassette, L. (2011). Video modeling and prompting: A comparison of two strategies for teaching cooking skills to students with mild intellectual disabilities. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 499-513.

Van Laarhoven, T., Munk, D. D., Zurita, L. M., Lynch, K., Zurita, B., Smith, T., & Chandler, L. (2008). The effectiveness of video tutorials for teaching preservice educators to use assistive technologies. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, *23*(4), 31-45.

Vanderheiden, G. C., Boyd, W., Mendenhall Jr, J. H., & Ford, K. (1991, September). Development of a multisensory nonvisual interface to computers for blind users. In *Proceedings of the Human Factors Society Annual Meeting* (Vol. 35, No. 5, pp. 315-318). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Vilaseca, R., Gràcia, M., Beltran, F. S., Dalmau, M., Alomar, E., Adam-Alcocer, A. L., & Simó-Pinatella, D. (2017). Needs and supports of people with intellectual disability and their families in Catalonia. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *30*(1), 33-46.

World Health Organization. (2022). Strategic action framework to improve access to assistive technology in the Eastern Mediterranean Region.

Wehmeyer, M., & Schwartz, M. (1997). Self-determination and positive adult outcomes: A follow-up study of youth with mental retardation or learning disabilities. *Exceptional children*, *63*(2), 245-255.

Weng, P. L., Savage, M. N., & Bouck, E. C. (2014). iDIY: Video-based instruction using iPads. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *47*(1), 11-19.

Wu, P. F., Wheaton, J. E., & Cannella-Malone, H. I. (2016). Effects of video prompting and activity schedules on the acquisition of independent living skills of students who are deaf and have developmental disabilities. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 366-378.